

Tolstoy applies equally well to these two thinkers: "The consciousness of self as willing, living, loving, striving toward the other whose term is God is a primary mode of self-knowledge which precedes all objectification and hence not reducible to any words about it" (265). The awareness of the self as a moral being (in earlier English usage "consciousness" and "conscience" were interchangeable as they still are in modern Romance languages where one word often covers both concepts) is both the beginning of true self-knowledge and the knowledge of God. Coleridge derived most of his teaching from his own introspective powers and from the German transcendental philosophers. While Newman was equally skilled at introspection, it has never been clear to me what his theoretical sources were and I wonder now, after reading Gustafson, if he might not have derived them from the same source as Tolstoy: the Greek Fathers with whom he was intimately familiar. My own ongoing research in British religious thought has been enormously stimulated by this brilliant book.

Richard F. Gustafson, Barnard College and Columbia University

These five critiques plus the substantial published reviews by McLean (Russian Review), Silbajoris (Slavic and East European Journal), and Lock (St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly) raise four major issues about my book Leo Tolstoy, Resident and Stranger, all of which are related to the methodological procedures I chose to follow. The first issue is the lack of attention to the diachronic flow of Tolstoy's life and the various changes in his art and thought. To many, I am aware, this seems a flaw, but I felt, and still do, that in order to demonstrate the remarkable consistency within the variety I had to narrow the focus. Had I chosen a chronological structure and paid attention to the many tributaries and brooks through which Tolstoy swam, I would have lost sight of the main stream of his thought and experience. One unfortunate result of this methodology, I now see, is that readings of some early works, in which I tried to show an embryonic version of later and clearer positions, have been disturbing because they seem to preclude other possible readings. Let me say that I am well aware that the psyche and its creations are overdetermined and can draw the conclusion from this that multiple readings of a text are inevitable. If I have been able to help people see a new aspect of Tolstoy—certainly not the only one—I shall be happy indeed.

The second main issue is related to the first. Many readers are disturbed by my failure to relate Tolstoy's ideas to thinkers who are considered to have been influential on him in one way or another at particular periods in his life. There are two reasons why I chose such an approach. First, I felt that continual asides

to discuss parallel ideas in others would have obscured the subject. I very much wanted to give a clear and organized presentation of Tolstoy's theology. And had I written a separate book on that subject, I might well have taken a diachronic approach with attention to changing influences. But I was also writing about the unity in all of Tolstoy and especially the relationship of the theology to the fiction. To do all of that together, and to try to present it in all its historical complexity, would have, I believe, obscured the basic argument. Secondly, the whole issue of influence is, in my opinion, a most vexed subject. While Tolstoy was obviously very well-read, his reading habits were peculiar. He claims that he did not continue to read a book if he did not agree with it. If that is even partly true, how does one assess influence? Furthermore, Tolstoy often did not read major thinkers seriously at all. To my knowledge he read very little Hegel or Fichte, for example. Indeed how much even of Kant or Plato did he know? Often Tolstoy read excerpts or summaries, as can be seen clearly in his quoted sources for What is Art? And finally even with those thinkers that Tolstoy did know well, and here one usually mentions Rousseau and Schopenhauer, how did he understand them? It is a bit simple-minded, it seems to me, to assume that he read them in quite the same way a late-twentieth-century, non-Russian reader would. I hope that someday we will have detailed studies of Tolstoy in his relationship to major thinkers, done with attention to the complex problems such a project entails. Above all I hope that in any study of Russian culture we can move from the prevalent model of influence, which seems to be the empty container into which foreign elements are cast, toward some understanding of the very dialogical nature of influence itself.

The third major area of discontent revolves around the parallels that I drew between Tolstoy's ideas and Eastern Christian thought. My intention was to show some structural similarities between the shape of Tolstoy's theological conceptions and those of some seminal Greek thinkers. This was not meant to be taken as an influence in the usual understanding. I meant it more as a "spiritual affinity," rather than an "intellectual debt," to use Gregg's terms, but I certainly do not assume that a spiritual affinity is necessarily and always "accidental." I can be accused of working with a theory of osmosis, as McLean does, since that is how I believe we do acquire at its most fundamental level our culture and especially our religious "beliefs." Religious understandings are shaped by cultural environment, and that environment in nineteenth-century Russia was strongly influenced by the Russian Orthodox tradition. Tolstoy himself always identified church with the Orthodox church. He was generally unfamiliar with Roman Catholicism and had only limited knowledge of Protestant theology. His first task after his "conversion" was a detailed study of Orthodox theology, especially the work of Macarius. His Christian outlook is shaped within the Orthodox framework, and when he dissents, he dissents from that worldview, which thereby shapes even his dissent.

A more serious question has been raised by Lock, who wonders if the model of Orthodoxy with which I work does not emanate more from twentieth-century Parisian Orthodox circles than from nineteenth-century Russia. In part this is true. But then it must be said that we do not yet have a good understanding of just what Orthodoxy was in nineteenth-century Russia. It was clearly in a period of change which had to do with the renewed emphasis on Greek patristics, the re-emergence of the hesychast tradition and the institution of elders, and the phenomenal growth of monasteries. It was this direction of change that led to the theological developments in Paris. That the Slavophiles and such leading figures as Dostoevsky, Solovyov, and Tolstoy were aware of all this is clearly attested. How all this is to be assessed, however, is not yet so clear. I would hope someday someone would write a study of Tolstoy's relationship to Orthodoxy. It will be the complex story of a man who attacks the official church (as did and do many Orthodox) and writes a detailed and critical study of its dogmatic theology, while reading saint's lives, diligently studying the Philokalia (with many marginal comments on his copy, waiting to be assessed by some scholar), and continuing to believe in the appropriateness of blessing oneself with the sign of the cross. If I have helped people to start to see that Tolstoy is not just some Western-style Protestant living in Russia, I will have accomplished my task.

Nor is Tolstoy some Buddhist or Taoist manqué. It is true that Tolstoy, in his later years, read a great deal in East religious philosophy. And there are affinities between some of his beliefs and certain Eastern doctrines. But are these influences? By the time Tolstoy began to read Eastern philosophy, his main theological ideas had already been shaped. Perhaps the more interesting question is what is the relationship of Eastern Christianity to the religions of the Far East? We already know of the similarity of hesychast practice to yoga. And certainly the strong Platonic and neo-Platonic traits in Eastern Christian thought structures have parallels in the Far East, and may even have their source in India. In general, it is time that we start to look at some of the differences from the West that Russian culture manifests, and one place to begin is in the Russian version of Orthodoxy.

Finally, some find it hard to abandon the received model of before and after, and therefore find that the theological readings of the earlier works are too distorting. This has especially troubled Orwin, who of all the reviewers seems least to understand me. I do not claim that the later ideas should be our "sole guide" to interpreting the earlier works. Nor am I interested in finding in the later religious thought a "perfect explanation" of the fiction. But I do think that the theological perspective can help us see aspects of the earlier texts often ignored. Orwin singles

out the dream of the globe of life and argues that I misread it. But can we accept her Rousseauian reading? Remember at this time Tolstoy was about to become involved in Schopenhauer whose vision is utterly un-Rousseauian, both in his understanding of "vitality" and in his evaluation of "selfishness" (Schopenhauer has a whole moral vision based on sympathy and compassion). Yes, the dream comes after Pierre has failed to respond to Karataev, but that does not necessarily mean that the lesson learned is the celebration of "natural selfishness." It might be, as Stilman argued long ago, that only now does Pierre begin to confront the forgotten Masonic precept about loving death, with its attendant revelation about the meaning of life. At any rate, I find it hard to conclude from these scenes that in War and Peace Tolstoy "defends as valuable in itself our natural vitality, the 'crust of animality' whose manifestation in the soul is self-love," although I am aware that there is a received opinion that early Tolstoy writes about "amoral vitality" and that people have read Natasha in this vein. By the way, in this scene how are we to understand the meaning of Karataev's story told just before the death (and which Tolstoy rewrote as God Sees The Truth But Waits)? Is not this story of clarified guilt and forgiveness significant, especially when we recall that Prince Andrew's dying vision is also embedded in a story of clarified guilt and forgiveness? In short, the reading depends upon which items one chooses to single out for attention. One way of seeing the difference between Orwin's reading and mine is that hers looks backward (Rousseau) and mine looks forward. Is the work of art a product of what the author has seen (or read) or an expression of what the author is beginning to see? I suppose it is at least both, hence the multiplicities of readings. At any rate, it is with the desire to shake up the fixed (and in my opinion rather too simplified) views of Tolstoy, that I offered my "new Tolstoy."

---